UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/052,735	01/18/2002	Robert Sesek	10016958-1	3209

7590   08/26/2004

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER
PANNALA, SATHYANARAYA R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2177	8

DATE MAILED: 08/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/052,735	SESEK ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Sathyanarayan Pannala	2177	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _18 January 2002_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-26_ is/are pending in the application.

　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-26_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

　　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　　a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

　　　1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　　2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

　　　3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
　　　　application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   The Application 10/052735 filed on 1/18/2002 has been examined. Claims 1-26
are pending in this Office Action.

Specification

2.   The abstract is objected because the abstract is a copy of the claim 1 and it is
also a part of the summary. Corrected abstract of the disclosure is required and must
be presented on a separate sheet, apart from any other text. Applicant is reminded of
the proper content of an abstract of the disclosure.

A patent abstract is a concise statement of the technical disclosure of the patent
and should include that which is new in the art to which the invention pertains. If the
patent is of a basic nature, the entire technical disclosure may be new in the art, and the
abstract should be directed to the entire disclosure. If the patent is in the nature of an
improvement in an old apparatus, process, product, or composition, the abstract should
include the technical disclosure of the improvement. In certain patents, particularly
those for compounds and compositions, wherein the process for making and/or the use
thereof are not obvious, the abstract should set forth a process for making and/or use
thereof. If the new technical disclosure involves modifications or alternatives, the
abstract should mention by way of example the preferred modification or alternative.

The abstract should not refer to purported merits or speculative applications of the

invention and should not compare the invention with the prior art.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public
>
> use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United
>
> States.

4.   Claims 1-5, 10-15, 19-22 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being

anticipated by Nielsen (US Patent 5870548) hereinafter Nielsen.

5.   As per independent claim 1, Nielsen anticipated by teaching a computer

controlled method for allowing an email sender to alter a previously sent email message

addressed to a recipient whose computer is beyond control of the sender's computer

(col. 3, lines 10-14). Nielsen teaches the claimed step of "determining whether a user

sent a copy of a document to a first set of at least one recipient" as once the email

message is created, it passes to an email transmission facility 203. A copy of the email

is saved in the sender's outbox 204 in the ending email system 200 (Fig. 2, col. 6,

lines 22-25); Further, Nielsen teaches the claimed step of "if the user sent the copy of

the document to the at least one recipient of the first set, correlating information with the

document so that a copy of a revised version of the document can be sent automatically to the at least one recipient of the first set" as depending on the sender's selections, the sender's email program constructs an action message 409 targeted toward the previously sent message, and send this constructed action message to the same recipients as the previously sent message (Fig. 4, col. 7, lines 13-17).

6.   As per dependent claim 2, Nielsen teaches the claimed step of "correlating comprises encoding the document with the information" as the sender's email program provides a mechanism that allows the sender to select a previously sent message 503 (Fig. 5, col. 7, lines 22-25).

7.   As per dependent claim 3, Nielsen teaches the claimed step of "the information comprises a location of the document in a device in which the document was created" as a sender creates a message using an email composition facility 201 on the sender's system 200 (Fig. 2, col. 6, lines 20-22).

8.   As per dependent claim 4, Nielsen teaches the claimed step of "the information comprises a location of the document in a device from which the document was sent" as a copy of the email is saved in the sender's outbox 204 in the sending email system 200 (Fig. 2, col. 6, lines 23-25).

9.   As per dependent claim 5, Nielsen teaches the claimed step of "the information

comprises addresses of the at least one recipient of the first set" as a computer

controlled method for allowing an email sender to alter a previously sent electronic

message addressed 611 to a recipient whose computer is beyond the control of the

sender (Fig. 6B, col. 3, lines 10-14).

10.   As per dependent claim 10, Nielsen teaches the claimed step of "automatically

enabling the at least one recipient of the first set to obtain the copy of the revised

version of the document if the at least one recipient of the first set accesses the copy of

the document" as the modified message is sent 763 to the recipient using the previously

sent message 659 (Fig. 6A, 7B, col. 11, lines 12-15) and the message database keeps

track of messages received location and where the message stored and the modified

previously sent message in the modified record (Fig. 8A,C, col. 12, lines 39-41).

Further, Nielsen teaches the comparison of modified previously sent message with

modified database record (Fig. 9, col. 14, lines 9-13).

11.   As per dependent claim 11, Nielsen teaches the claimed step of "providing a

graphical user interface enabling a user to select an option to obtain the copy of the

revised version of the document upon accessing the copy of the document" as the most

computer systems provide a GUI to evoking commands or computer operations (col. 5,

lines 21-25).

12.   As per dependent claim 12, Nielsen teaches the claimed step of "selecting a

threshold, the attainment of which enables the copy of the revised version of the

document to be obtained upon accessing the copy of the document" as the recipient if

not seen the previously sent message before receiving the modified message, the

previously sent message will be deleted and modified message is saved (Fig. 11A,

col. 16, lines 16-23).

13.   As per dependent claim 13, Nielsen teaches the claimed step of "the threshold is

one of a date, a day, and a time" as the seven days are considered as threshold period

for deleting previous email after receiving the revised email (Fig. 8D, 11B, col. 17,

lines 17-20).

14.   As per dependent claim 14, Nielsen teaches the claimed step of "providing a

graphical user interface that allows the user to change the information so that the at

least one recipient of the first set receives the copy of the revised version of the

document every time the at least one recipient accesses the copy of the document" as

the selectable control area "Modify This Message" 677 activates the process of allowing

the user to edit the message (Fig. 6D, col. 9, lines 12-22).

15.   As per independent claim 15, Nielsen anticipated by teaching a computer

controlled system for allowing an email sender to alter a previously sent email message

addressed to a recipient whose computer is beyond control of the sender's computer

(col. 3, lines 10-14). Nielsen teaches the claimed "a document-sending system" as a

computer system configured to support an email application (Fig. 1B, col. 6, lines 5-9).

Further, Nielsen teaches the claimed "determine whether a user sent a copy of a

document to a first set of at least one recipient" as once the email message is created, it

passes to an email transmission facility 203. A copy of the email is saved in the

sender's outbox 204 in the ending email system 200 (Fig. 2, col. 6, lines 22-25); Further,

Nielsen teaches the claimed "correlate information with the document so that a copy of

a revised version of the document can be sent automatically, if the user sent the copy of

the document to the at least one recipient of the first set" as depending on the sender's

selections, the sender's email program constructs an action message 409 targeted

toward the previously sent message, and send this constructed action message to the

same recipients as the previously sent message (Fig. 4, col. 7, lines 13-17).

16.   As per dependent claim 19, Nielsen teaches the claimed step of "automatically

enabling the at least one recipient of the first set to obtain the copy of the revised

version of the document if the at least one recipient of the first set accesses the copy of

the document" as the modified message is sent 763 to the recipient using the previously

sent message 659 (Fig. 6A, 7B, col. 11, lines 12-15) and the message database keeps

track of messages received location and where the message stored and the modified

previously sent message in the modified record (Fig. 8A,C, col. 12, lines 39-41).

Further, Nielsen teaches the comparison of modified previously sent message with

modified database record (Fig. 9, col. 14, lines 9-13).

17.   As per dependent claim 20, Nielsen teaches the claimed step of "selecting a

threshold, the attainment of which enables the copy of the revised version of the

document to be obtained upon accessing the copy of the document" as the recipient if

not seen the previously sent message before receiving the modified message, the

previously sent message will be deleted and modified message is saved (Fig. 11A,

col. 16, lines 16-23).

18.   As per dependent claim 21, Nielsen teaches the claimed step of "provides a

graphical user interface that allows the user to change the information so that the at

least one recipient of the first set receives the copy of the revised version of the

document every time the at least one recipient accesses the copy of the document" as

the selectable control area "Modify This Message" 677 activates the process of allowing

the user to edit the message (Fig. 6D, col. 9, lines 12-22).

19.   As per independent claim 22, Nielsen anticipated by teaching a computer

controlled method and storage medium for allowing an email sender to alter a

previously sent email message addressed to a recipient whose computer is beyond

control of the sender's computer (col. 3, lines 10-14). Nielsen teaches the claimed

"logic configured to determine whether a user sent a copy of a document to a first set of

at least one recipient" as once the email message is created, it passes to an email

transmission facility 203. A copy of the email is saved in the sender's outbox 204 in the

ending email system 200 (Fig. 2, col. 6, lines 22-25). Further, Nielsen teaches the

claimed "logic configured to correlate information with the document so that a copy of a revised version of the document can be sent automatically, the logic correlates the information if the user sent the copy of the document to the at least one recipient of the first set" as depending on the sender's selections, the sender's email program constructs an action message 409 targeted toward the previously sent message, and send this constructed action message to the same recipients as the previously sent message (Fig. 4, col. 7, lines 13-17).

20.   As per dependent claim 26, Nielsen teaches the claimed step of "logic configured to automatically enable the at least one recipient of the first set to obtain the copy of the revised version of the document, the logic automatically enables if the at least one recipient of the first set accesses the copy of the document" as the modified message is sent 763 to the recipient using the previously sent message 659 (Fig. 6A, 7B, col. 11, lines 12-15) and the message database keeps track of messages received location and where the message stored and the modified previously sent message in the modified record (Fig. 8A,C, col. 12, lines 39-41). Further, Nielsen teaches the comparison of modified previously sent message with modified database record (Fig. 9, col. 14, lines 9-13).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

21.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set

forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and

the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.

Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims

under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was

commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the

contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and

invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in

order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e),

(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

22.   Claims 6-9, 16-18, 23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Nielsen (US Patent 5,870,548) hereinafter Nielsen and in view of

Naylor et al. (US Patent 6,625,642) hereinafter Naylor.

23.   As per dependent claim 6, Nielsen teaches the claimed step of "appending the

information with addresses of the at least one recipient of the second set, if the user

sent the copy of the document to the at least one recipient of the second set" as the

user can select a previously sent email 659 for sending revised documents (Fig. 6A,

col. 7, lines 51-54). Nielsen teaches sending an email and resending the revised email

to same recipients and do not explicitly teach sending the same mail to additional

recipients. However, Naylor teaches the claimed step of "determining whether the user

sent the copy of the document to at least one recipient of a second set" as the server

sends the email after stripping the tags and associated data (Fig. 1, col. 9, lines 28-36).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of the cited references because the process of transmitting email by Naylor would have provided Nielsen's with necessary method, which would allow the sender to send the messages to all recipients at one time.   Further, by combining Naylor's method would have allowed Nielsen's method to send emails to one or several recipients (col. 2, lines 4-6).

24.   As per dependent claim 7, Nielsen teaches the claimed step of "appending the information with addresses of the at least one recipient of the third set, if the at least one recipient of the second set sent the copy of the document to the at least one recipient of the third set" as the user can select a previously sent email 659 for sending revised document (Fig. 6A, col. 7, lines 51-54). Nielsen teaches sending an email and resending the revised email to same recipients and do not explicitly teach sending the same mail to additional recipients. However, Naylor teaches the claimed step of "determining whether the at least one recipient of the second set sent the copy of the document to at least one recipient of a third set" as the forwarding the emails to appropriate recipients (Fig. 3, col. 9, lines 57-62). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of the cited references because the process of transmitting email by Naylor would have provided Nielsen's with necessary method, which would allow the sender to send the messages to all recipients at one time.   Further, by combining

Naylor's method would have allowed Nielsen's method to send emails to one or several

recipients (col. 2, lines 4-6).

25.   As per dependent claim 8, Nielsen teaches the claimed step of "the copy of the

revised version of the document to be sent to the at least one recipient of the first,

second, and third sets when the revised version of the document is saved" as the user

can select a previously sent email 659 for sending revised document (Fig. 6A, col. 7,

lines 51-54).

26.   As per dependent claim 9, Nielsen teaches the claimed step of "providing a

graphical user interface enabling the user to choose an option to send the copy of the

revised version of the document" as the most computer systems provide a GUI to

evoking commands or computer operations (col. 5, lines 21-25).

27.   As per dependent of claim 16, Nielsen teaches the claimed "append the

information with addresses of the at least one recipient of the second set, if the user

sent the copy of the document to the at least one recipient of the second set" as the

user can select a previously sent email 659 for sending revised documents (Fig. 6A,

col. 7, lines 51-54). Nielsen teaches sending an email and resending the revised email

to same recipients and do not explicitly teach sending the same mail to additional

recipients. However, Naylor teaches the claimed "determine whether the user sent the

copy of the document to at least one recipient of a second set" as the server sends the

email after stripping the tags and associated data (Fig. 1, col. 9, lines 28-36). Thus, it

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of

the invention to incorporate the teachings of the cited references because the process

of transmitting email by Naylor would have provided Nielsen's with necessary method,

which would allow the sender to send the messages to all recipients at one time.

Further, by combining Naylor's and Nielsen's systems, would have allowed Nielsen's

system to send emails to one or several recipients (col. 2, lines 4-6).

28.   As per dependent of claim 17, Nielsen teaches the claimed "append the

information with addresses of the at least one recipient of the third set, if the at least one

recipient of the second set sent the copy of the document to the at least one recipient of

the third set" as the user can select a previously sent email 659 for sending revised

document (Fig. 6A, col. 7, lines 51-54). Nielsen teaches sending an email and

resending the revised email to same recipients and do not explicitly teach sending the

same mail to additional recipients. However, Naylor teaches the claimed "determine

whether the at least one recipient of the second set sent the copy of the document to at

least one recipient of a third set" as the forwarding the emails to appropriate recipients

(Fig. 3, col. 9, lines 57-62). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the data processing art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of the

cited references because the process of transmitting email by Naylor would have

provided Nielsen's with necessary method, which would allow the sender to send the

messages to all recipients at one time. Further, by combining Naylor's and Nielsen's

systems, would have allowed Nielsen's system to send emails to one or several

recipients (col. 2, lines 4-6).

29.   As per dependent of claim 18, Nielsen teaches the claimed "the copy of the

revised version of the document to be sent to the at least one recipient of the first set

when the revised version of the document is saved" as the user can select a previously

sent email 659 for sending revised document (Fig. 6A, col. 7, lines 51-54).

30.   As per dependent claim 23, Nielsen teaches the claimed "the logic configured to

append the information with addresses of the at least one recipient of the second set,

the logic appends if the user sent the copy of the document to the at least one recipient

of the second set" as the user can select a previously sent email 659 for sending

revised documents   (Fig. 6A, col. 7, lines 51-54). Nielsen teaches sending an email

and resending the revised email to same recipients and do not explicitly teach sending

the same mail to additional recipients. However, Naylor teaches the claimed "logic

configured to determine whether the user sent a copy of the document to at least one

recipient of the second set" as the server sends the email after stripping the tags and

associated data (Fig. 1, col. 9, lines 28-36). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the invention to incorporate the

teachings of the cited references because the process of transmitting email by Naylor

would have provided Nielsen's with necessary method, which would allow the sender to

send the messages to all recipients at one time.   Further, by combining Naylor's

method and Nielsen's method would have allowed Nielsen's method to send emails to one or several recipients (col. 2, lines 4-6).

31.   As per dependent claim 24, Nielsen teaches the claimed "logic configured to append the information with addresses of the at least one recipient of the third set, the logic appends if the user sent the copy of the document to the at least one recipient of the second set sent the copy of the document to the at least one recipient of the third set" as the user can select a previously sent email 659 for sending revised document (Fig. 6A, col. 7, lines 51-54). Nielsen teaches sending an email and resending the revised email to same recipients and do not explicitly teach sending the same mail to additional recipients. However, Naylor teaches the claimed step of "logic configured to determine whether the at least one recipient of the second set sent the copy of the document to at least one recipient of a third set" as the forwarding the emails to appropriate recipients (Fig. 3, col. 9, lines 57-62). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of the cited references because the process of transmitting email by Naylor would have provided Nielsen's with necessary method, which would allow the sender to send the messages to all recipients at one time. Further, by combining Naylor's method and Nielsen's method, would have allowed Nielsen's method to send emails to one or several recipients (col. 2, lines 4-6).

32.   As per dependent claim 25, Nielsen teaches the claimed "logic configured to

automatically enable the copy of the revised version of the document to be sent to the at

least one recipient of the first set, the logic automatically enables when the revised

version of the document is saved" as the user can select a previously sent email 659 for

sending revised document (Fig. 6A, col. 7, lines 51-54).

Conclusion

33.   The prior art made of record, listed on form PTO-892, and not relied upon, if any,

is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

34.   If a reference indicated, as being mailed on PTO-FORM 892 has not been

enclosed in this action, please contact Lisa Craney whose telephone number is (703)

305-9601 for faster service.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Sathyanarayan Pannala whose telephone number is

(703) 305-3390. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (703) 305-9790. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Sathyanarayan Pannala
Examiner
Art Unit 2177

srp
August 19, 2004